

IN THE CLAIMS:

Please amend claims 24 and 37-40 as follows:

24. (Amended) A pickup for a musical instrument, the pickup comprising:
a first wire coil; ²⁶
a second wire coil disposed proximate the first wire coil; ²⁷
at least one magnet disposed at least partially within both the first wire coil and the second wire coil; and
a completely flat ferromagnetic plate disposed intermediate the first wire coil and the second wire coil.

37. (Amended) A pickup for a musical instrument, the pickup comprising:
a first wire coil;
a second wire coil;
a completely flat ferromagnetic plate disposed in a substantially magnetically neutral location between the first wire coil and the second wire coil; and
wherein the first wire coil and the second wire coil are configured so as to create a humbucking effect.

38. (Amended) A guitar comprising:
a body;
a pickup disposed upon the body, the pickup comprising:
a first wire coil;
a second wire coil;
a completely flat ferromagnetic plate disposed in a substantially magnetically neutral location between the first wire coil and the second wire coil; and
wherein the first wire coil and the second wire coil are configured so as to create a humbucking effect.

39. (Amended) A method for forming a pickup for a musical instrument, the method comprising:
providing a first wire coil;
providing a second wire coil;
providing a completely flat ferromagnetic plate; and
assembling the first wire coil, the second wire coil and the ferromagnetic plate such that
the ferromagnetic plate is disposed intermediate the first wire coil and the second wire coil in a
substantially magnetically neutral location.

40. (Amended) A method for converting vibrations of strings of a musical instrument into
electrical signals representative thereof, the method comprising:
providing a pickup comprising a completely flat ferromagnetic plate disposed between
two wire coils;
causing at least one string to vibrate so as to vary current in the two wire coils; and
humbucking the two coils so as to mitigate noise therefrom.

REMARKS

This is a response to the Office Action mailed July 24, 2002. In that Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 22-40 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-23 of U.S. Patent Number 6,291,759; rejected claims 22-40 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-13 of U.S. Patent Number 6,291,785; rejected claims 37-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being met by either of Kinman '999 or Blucher *et al.*

It should be noted that only claims 24-40 are presently pending in this application. Claim 1 was cancelled in the SUPPLEMENTAL PRELIMINARY AMENDMENT dated January 28, 2002, and claims 2-23 were cancelled in the PRELIMINARY AMENDMENT filed along with this patent application.